## REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 4, 2005. Claims 1-80 are pending, with claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 45, 46, and 67 being in independent form. By this Amendment, the specification and Fig. 20 of the drawings have been amended to correct informalities, and claims 24, 67, 76 and 77 have been amended to correct informalities in the claims.

The specification was objected to as having informalities.

By this Amendment, page 38 of the specification has been amended to correct the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Regarding the description on pages 36 and 37 corresponding to Fig. 20, it is noted that Fig. 20 is being amended by this Amendment to conform with the description on pages 36 and 37.

Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 67, 76 and 77 were objected to as having informalities.

By this Amendment, claims 24, 67, 76 and 77 have been amended to correct informalities in the claims.

Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5).

The Office Action stated that Figs. 13B and 16 were objected to because not all reference designations (specifically, step S144 and step S164) shown in the figures are described in the specification.

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended to include references to step S144 and step S164, and Fig. 20 has been amended to correct references therein.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 23 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,002,490 to Suzuki. Claims 67, 68, 71 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,696,598 to Yoshida et al. (hereinafter "Yoshida '598"). Claims 2-4, 6, 24-26, 28, 46-48 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,219 to Saito et al. Claims 5, 27 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,335,966 to Toyoda (hereinafter "Toyoda '966"). Claims 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 29, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 51, 54, 55, 59, 60 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,609 to Yamamuro. Claims 8, 9, 19, 30, 31, 41, 52, 53 and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of Yamamuro further in view of Toyoda '966. Claims 13, 14, 35, 36, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of Yamamuro further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,816,911 to Toyoda et al. (hereinafter "Toyoda '911"). Claims 17, 20, 39, 42, 61 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of Yamamuro further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,103 to Toyoda et al. (hereinafter "Toyoda '103"). Claims 21, 43 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of Yamamuro further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,959,741 to Yoshida et al. (hereinafter "Yoshida '741"). Claims 12, 22, 34, 44, 56 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Saito further in view of Yamamuro further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,658 to Connors et al.

Claim 69 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Toyoda '103. Claim 70 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,846 to Nobuta. Claim 73 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Yamamuro. Claims 74 and 75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Toyoda '966. Claims 76 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Toyoda '966 further in view of Connors. Claim 78 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Toyoda '103. Claim 79 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of Yoshida '741. Claim 80 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yoshida '598 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,759 to Ikegami et al.

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 45, 46, and 67 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

This application relates to communications methodologies and apparatuses, such as for facsimile communications, capable of using functions of other facsimile terminals, such as a color printing capability. Facsimile apparatuses with advanced functions, such as color image receiving and printing capabilities, can be very costly. In addition, while a facsimile terminal may notify other facsimile apparatuses that the terminal has a color printing capability, in many instances the other facsimile apparatuses will transmit a mono-color grayscale image to the terminal which requires specific hardware and/or software different from the color printing capability.

Applicant devised techniques which allow an office (or other facility having a need for

facsimile communication) which uses plural facsimile apparatuses to share communications capabilities (such as for color images) amongst the plural facsimile apparatuses, while those capabilities are not resident on each and every one of the plural facsimile apparatuses. For example, a facsimile apparatus not having a color printing capability may maintain a register of one (or more) of the other facsimile apparatuses which has a color image communications capability (and/or other communications capabilities). When the facsimile apparatus receives color image communications from a sending machine, the facsimile apparatus notifies the sending machine of the color printing capability, and transfers the color image information to the registered facsimile apparatus having color printing capability (for example, the "transfer communications machine" referenced in the application). Thus, even when a receiving side communications terminal apparatus does not have the color printing capability, it can receive color image communications and transfer the color image information to a transfer communications machine which has the color printing capability. The pending claims cover these features.

For example, claim 1 is directed to a communications terminal apparatus comprising a communications mechanism, a registering mechanism, a notifying mechanism and a controlling mechanism. The communications mechanism performs communications with a plurality of communications machines including a sending communications machine and a transfer communications machine. The registering mechanism registers an address and a communications capability of the transfer communications machine. The notifying mechanism notifies of the communications capability of the transfer communications machine registered in the registering mechanism. The controlling mechanism instructs the notifying mechanism to notify the sending communications machine of the communications capability at a beginning of

communications and to instruct the communications mechanism to transfer image information received from the sending communications machine to the transfer communications machine using the address stored in the registering mechanism.

Independent claim 67 is directed to a method comprising receiving a fax transmission at a receiving fax machine which checks through an automated process if the fax transmission contains color image information, and if the checking determines that the fax transmission contains color image information, transferring at least the color image information, through an automated process, from the receiving fax machine to a transfer fax machine that has color printing capabilities for printing of the color image information.

Suzuki and Yoshida '598 are the primary references cited in the Office Action.

Suzuki, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a color digital image composing apparatus comprising plural internal devices, such as an image reading device, an image output device and an image display device. Fig. 1 of Suzuki shows a block diagram of the color digital image composing apparatus. Communication device 108 of Suzuki is provided for connecting to an external communication network through which the color digital image composing apparatus can communicate with other communications machines. Column 7, lines 33-45 of Suzuki discloses that the apparatus registers (i) data which tracks the connections between the devices and (ii) the system parameters specific to each device. Column 1, line 63 through column 2, line 5 discloses that prior to communications with another apparatus, the registered data and system parameters is communicated to the other apparatus so that each apparatus knows the capability of the other.

However, Suzuki does not disclose that the color digital image composing apparatus receives image information from a sending communications machine (external to the apparatus)

and transfers the image information to a transfer communications machine (external to the apparatus). Applicant does not find teaching or suggestion in Suzuki of transferring a color image received from a sending communications machine to a transfer fax machine that has color printing capabilities, as covered by the claimed invention.

Yoshida '598, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a facsimile apparatus which includes means for discriminating whether a received image is color image and whether a destination has a color image capability. If a color image is received and the destination has a color image capability, the received color image is transmitted to the destination. On the other hand, if the destination is incapable of receiving color transmission, the received color image is converted to a monochromic image and then sent to the destination. Stated another way, according to Yoshida '598, the received image always will be transmitted to the destination specified by the sending machine, either as a color image or as a monochrome image, depending on the capabilities of the destination.

On the other hand, Yoshida '598 does not disclose that the facsimile apparatus will transfer the received color image to a transfer fax machine that has color printing capabilities. Applicant does not find teaching or suggestion in Yoshida '598 of transferring a color image received from a sending communications machine to a transfer fax machine that has color printing capabilities, as covered by the claimed invention.

Saito, as understood by Applicant, is directed to an Internet facsimile apparatus. The Office Action cites Saito as purportedly disclosing a mechanism for notifying of an enhancement communications capability.

Toyoda '966, as understood by Applicant, is directed to an Internet facsimile apparatus which inquires a server the capability of a destination, and then adapts an image to be suitable to

the capability of the destination.

Yamamuro, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a facsimile apparatus including means for communicating with a host computer to transfer image data from the host computer. The facsimile apparatus includes means for stopping the transfer from the host computer if image data stored in a memory of the facsimile apparatus has reached a predetermined volume.

Toyoda '911, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a relay apparatus for relaying image information from a terminal on a computer network to a facsimile apparatus on a telephone network. Toyoda '911 was cited in the Office Action as purportedly disclosing a mechanism for performing a retry call after detecting that the destination is busy.

Toyoda '103, as understood by Applicant, is directed to image data communication between an electronic mail apparatus and a facsimile apparatus.

Yoshida '741, as understood by Applicant, is directed to facsimile processing whereby image data is processed according to a received sub-address signal.

Connors, as understood by Applicant, is directed to a networked multifunction device, including a facsimile function, which maintains a queue of jobs to be performed. When the device receives a job requiring a facsimile function, the device checks the queue for facsimile jobs. If no facsimile jobs are on the queue, the job is transmitted in accordance with job priority control arrangement of the device. If prior facsimile jobs are on the queue, the device looks for another networked having facsimile capability.

Nobuta, as understood by Applicant, is directed to image communication of a mixed file (that is, including both color images and monochrome images).

Ikegami, as understood by Applicant, is directed to an apparatus capable of handling both color images and monochrome images and having multiple selectable modes for handling a

received document containing a color page, including (1) all pages of received document are output only, (2) only color pages of the received document are output, (3) all pages are transferred to an external apparatus, or (4) only color pages are transferred to the external apparatus.

Applicant does not find disclosure or suggestion by the cited art, however, of a communications terminal wherein the communications mechanism performs communications with a sending communications machine and a transfer communications machine, the registering mechanism registers an address and a communications capability of the transfer communications machine, the controlling mechanism instructs the communications mechanism to transfer image information received from the sending communications machine to the transfer communications machine which calls for the communications capability of the transfer communications machine, as provided by the claimed invention of claim 1.

Independent claims 2, 23, 24, 45, 46, and 67 are patentably distinct from the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 2, 23, 24, 45, 46, and 67, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the amendments and remarks above, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The replacement sheet of drawings for Fig. 20 attached hereto as **Exhibit A** includes changes to, and replaces, Fig. 20 of the original sheets of drawings. More specifically, steps S182-S185 in original Fig. 20 have been renumbered S192-S195, respectively, in replacement Fig. 20, in order to be consistent with the corresponding description of the steps in the specification. In addition, steps S186-S189 in original Fig. 20 correspond to steps S187-S190 in Fig. 19 and therefore have been renumbered S187-S190, respectively, in replacement Fig. 20.

Attachment: replacement sheet of drawings for Fig. 20